

(SM. BELLARY SIDDAMMA.)

eradicating disease and illness with a view to help the raiyats;

(b) the number and names of villages in each district that have derived benefit by this?

A.—Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(a) Nil.

(b) Does not arise in view of the reply to Clause (a).

**S. No. 8 of Becharak Village of Balenahalli (Disposal of Darkhast applications).**

Q.—556. Sri C. T. HANUMANTHAIA (Pavagada—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it has come to their notice that five landless persons of Kumbarahalli, Gowdagere Hobli, Sira Taluk, have given darkhast applications under the Depressed Class Rules for the grant of land in Survey No. 8 of Becharak village, Balenahalli;

(b) if so, the reason for not granting the land till now?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(a) Sriyuts Hanumanthappa and 5 other Depressed Class applicants had applied for grant of land out of Date Reserve S. No. 8 of Balenahalli, Sira Taluk.

(b) The land asked for is a Date Reserve not released for cultivation. Since all Date Groves in Sira Taluk have been reserved by Government and as some of the villagers protested against the disposal of the land and as the applicants were reported to have sold their ancestral property, the Darkhast applications were rejected.

**Election to House Committee.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Chair desires to announce that in connection with the election to the House Committee as

the number of candidates to be elected is equal to the number of Members who have signified their intention, the following members are declared elected and consequently there will be no election on Tuesday the 22nd instant.

Sriyuts:

- 1 B. Chickanna
- 2 M. Chickalingiah
- 3 U. M. Madappa
- 4 Mudduramiah
- 5 Shivananje Gowda
- 6 T. G. Thimme Gowda

Under sub-rule (2) of rule 175 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly the Deputy Speaker of the Assembly will be the Chairman of the Committee.

**Election to the Committee of Privileges.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Chair desires to announce that in connection with the election to the Committee of Privileges, as the number of candidates is equal to the number to be elected, the following candidates are declared elected and there will be no election to-day.

Sriyuts—

1. K. Prabhakar
2. Mali Mariyappa
3. M. Rajasekharamurthy
4. L. Siddappa

Under sub-rule (2) of rule 171 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, I nominate the following three members to the Committee.

Sriyuts—

1. A. Bheemappa Naik
2. K. Singari Gowda
3. Sydney A. Thomas

Under sub-rule (3) of rule 171 of the Rules, I appoint Sri L. Siddappa to be the Chairman of the Committee.

1 P.M.

**Procedure when discussing Demands.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—The procedure to be followed when demands for grant,

are under debate has been coming up almost every year. I find that a comprehensive and detailed ruling on this subject has been given by my predecessor on the 19th of March last year.

As stated therein, and as I observed on Saturday last, so far as the Chair is concerned, it is guided by the Rules. The Rules give the right to every member, irrespective of the party to which he belongs, to give notice of cut motions and so long as a cut motion is admissible under the Rules, it has to be taken up irrespective of to which party the member belongs. Further these cut motions are printed in order of receipt and the Chair has no option but to take up the cut motions in the order in which they appear on the notice paper.

It has been suggested that cut motions should be tabled only by members of the Opposition. The other suggestions are that cut motions need not be taken up at all but the Opposition may be permitted to select subjects for debate for each day, and in the alternative, that only selected cut motions should be taken up for debate. I may state that these are all matters which are guided by understanding and agreement between the parties or members and the Chair has no voice in the procedure selected. But if any such understanding is reached among the members and is brought to the notice of the Chair, the Chair will always take note of such agreement and will implement it.

The question was raised about unattached members. I can only say, once again, that the Rules make no distinction between member and member. Even in England where the party system works so well, while the right to select the subject is left to the Opposition and independent members have no voice in the selection, the independent members do participate in the resulting debate.

There is no doubt, as observed by my predecessor, that, in order that the few days allotted for voting may serve a useful purpose, and in order that Government may be informed of the views of the House or the policies pursued by them, it is better that the

members try to focus attention on the larger issues as far as possible.

I would, therefore, appeal to the Hon'ble Members, to whichever party they may belong, to try to evolve a satisfactory procedure by which the time spent on voting will prove useful and serve a purpose. But in the absence of such agreement the Chair can only follow the Rules.

Sri A. Bheemappa Naik wanted me to give a ruling on whether a statement made by the Leader of the House could not be questioned by a member of that party. This again is a matter on which the Speaker cannot and need not give a ruling. The organisation of parties and the working of the party machinery are beyond the purview of the Speaker. I may, however, say that unless the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition can claim, and can be deemed, to speak for their parties, the work of the House is likely to be hampered, and it will not help in the smooth working of the Assembly.

#### **Member's right to withdraw Notice of Motion.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—On Saturday last Sri V. Venkatappa and Sri A. Bheemappa Naik questioned the right of Sri K. Puttaswamy to withdraw his notice of a matter which he stated affected his privilege. This related to an incorrect and misleading report of the Proceedings in the 'Janavani' of the 16th. When Sri Puttaswamy raised it in the House on the 17th, I requested the Hon'ble Member to give a written notice which he did the same day. But before the Chair took a decision on the question of whether a *prima facie* case of privilege had been made out, the Hon'ble Member withdrew his notice. There was thus nothing for the Chair to decide and the matter therefore dropped. However, as the Hon'ble Member had also orally raised the matter in the House itself, I thought it desirable to state the fact of withdrawal to the House.

It is only when a matter is formally before the House and the House is seized of it, as after a motion has been moved, that the member who has made